REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that claims 10-13 and 19 are allowable.

The Examiner has noted various typographical errors in the claims, which Applicant has corrected in the current amendment.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8, 14-16, and 20-24 under 35 USC 103. The claims have been amended to correct various typographical errors. Claims 1-8, 10-16, and 18-24 remain pending. Applicant respectfully asserts that each of the pending claims is now allowable.

With respect to the objection to the drawings, Applicant respectfully submits that the features noted by the Examiner have been identified in FIG. 5 that has previously been submitted.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1, 14, 22-24 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, Applicant respectfully submits that the relationship between the shared services and the virtual private networks is clear from the claim language. Specifically, the shared services are provided by the network device. A default route to the network device is received and included in each of the routing tables associated with the virtual private networks. Thus, each of the virtual private networks may access the shared services provided by the network device via the default route identified in the corresponding routing table.

With respect to the rejection of claim 22 under 35 USC 101, the specification has been amended accordingly.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 6-8, 14-16, 18, 20, 21 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Liu et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,928,082, ('Liu' hereinafter) in view of Prince, U.S. Pat. No. 5,852,606, ('Prince' hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is important to note that Liu fails to disclose or suggest a plurality of routing tables, as the Examiner suggests. Applicant notes that the Examiner refers to NAT 26a, 26b of FIG. 1 of Liu. However, Liu clearly discloses that these elements are NAT servers, not routing tables. In fact, Liu fails to disclose or suggest the use of routing tables in any manner, much less the manner claimed.

Moreover, a translation table of a NAT server is not a routing table. A translation table is maintained by a NAT device, and is typically used to translate addresses between private addresses and public addresses. In contrast, a routing table is generally used by network devices such as routers and switches to route packets. Specifically, it is well-known that routing tables stores the routes to various nodes in the network, as well as the next hop. Although they are both "tables," the function served by a translation table is not the same as a routing table. In fact, a translation table does not store routes to nodes in the network, and cannot be used to route packets via a next hop.

Liu fails to disclose or suggest "receiving a default route to a network device providing one or more shared services, the default route <u>to the network device providing one or more shared services</u> being advertised by the network device providing one or more shared services, wherein each of the shared services is available to each of the plurality of virtual private networks." Col. 2, lines 37-40 of Liu merely disclose "establishing a call signaling connection between the first telephony client located on a private network and the second telephone client on the Internet." Clearly, neither the first telephony client nor the second telephony client provides one or more shared services to a plurality of virtual private networks. Moreover, nothing in Liu discloses or suggests the advertisement by a network device providing shared services of a default route to the network device.

Prince fails to cure the deficiencies of Liu. In fact, the Examiner notes that Prince relates to updating a "translation table," not a routing table. See col. 6, lines 6-10. Thus, the combination of the cited references would fail to operate as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 2, 6-8, 14-16, 18, 20, 21 are patentable over the cited references.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 3-5 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Liu and Prince, and further in view of Palnati et al, U.S. Pat. No. 5,991,297, ('Palnati' hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Palnati fails to cure the deficiencies of the references noted above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 3-5 are patentable over the cited references.

The dependent claims depend from one of the independent claims and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. However, the dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish them from the cited references. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed, as the above discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103(a).

SUMMARY

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 504480 (Order No. <u>CISCP340</u>).

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/Elise R. Heilbrunn/
Elise R. Heilbrunn
Reg. No. 42,649

Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP
P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
Tel: (510) 663-1100